

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This communication is in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated March 23, 2009. Claims 1-14 were previously canceled, without prejudice. Claim 26 has been amended. New claims 27-31 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 15-31 remain pending in this application with claims 1 and 26 being the only independent claims. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

### **Prior Art Claim Rejections**

Claims 15, 18, 21-23, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0107648 (Stewart et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112354 (Ortiz et al.).

Claims 16, 17, 19, 20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Stewart et al. and Ortiz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,930,994 (Stubbs).

Applicant respectfully traverses the prior art rejections for at least the reasons discussed below.

### **Independent Claims 15 & 26**

Claim 15 calls for “checking that a subscriber relationship (8, 9) of the mobile communication system and/or a temporary IP address is associated with a corresponding transmitter and receiver, wherein the two subscriber relationships and/or the IP addresses are linked in a database of the operator (11) of the mobile communication system,” and “checking authorization of the receiver for receiving the video data from the transmitter, based on the linked data.” (emphasis added)

The Examiner acknowledges that Stewart fails to disclose or teach these claimed limitations, stating instead that they are taught by Ortiz et al. (paragraphs [0071], [0073], [0076]). Referring to the relevant paragraphs cited by the Examiner, Ortiz et al. discloses “Additionally, a security unit may be utilized to process proper security codes to thereby ensure that data transferred to and from hand held device 11 may be secure and/or permitted. Broadcast security

prevents general receipt of venue images without proprietary hardware and/or signals.” (paragraph [0058]) Ortiz et al. further states that “The equipment may also provide for the securing transmission of signals and associated data. For example, such equipment can rely on the encryption of signals. These signals, if encrypted, can be decrypted by authorized hand held receivers.” [0071] Accordingly, Ortiz et al. teaches that only authorized hand held receivers employ the necessary hardware/software to decrypt the encrypted data. The reference fails to disclose or suggest a database for linking the two subscriber relationships and/or the IP addresses or checking authorization based on the linked data in the database, as expressly called for in claim 15.

Claim 26 is the apparatus counterpart of method claim 15 and thus patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons described above with respect to claim 15.

#### **Dependent Claims 17 & 28**

Claim 17 specifies “setting up a connection between transmitter and receiver by dialing the associated mobile subscriber telephone number (MSISDN) or an IP address.” In rejecting claim 17 the Examiner states that Stewart et al. (Col. 6, ll. 15-20) reads on this limitation. The passage referred to by the Examiner states “The PUD [Packet User Database] 52 holds call group records for identifying the members of a call group. Referring to FIG. 4, which shows an exemplary call group record, a field for a single call group is identified by a call group ID containing fields 60, two or more mobile station IDs, MSID1, MSID2,...,MSIDn are contained in fields 62, and each mobile station ID field 62 has an associated call seize field 64 flagged to indicate that the associated mobile station has currently seized the call group.” (emphasis added) Stewart et al. discloses mobile station IDs (e.g., MSID1, MSID2,...,MSIDn), not telephone numbers dialed to set up a connection between transmitter and receiver, as found in claim 17.

Claim 28 is a similar apparatus counterpart of method claim 17 and contains similar limitations to those found in claim 17. Accordingly, claim 28 is patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17.

#### **Dependent Claims 18 & 29**

Claim 18 provides “storing routing rules for transmitting video data between the

transmitter and receiver in the database.” It is the Examiner’s position that this limitation is taught by paragraphs [0018]-[0019] of Stewart et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Stewart et al. discloses that “The hub 16 includes a router 28 that routes video streams to requesting clients 14 using a wireless link. The clients 14 can access the video streams by establishing communication with the hub 16 and authenticating themselves to a conditional access module 30 at the hub 16. That is, to access a particular stream a client 14 establishes communication with the hub 16 and requests a particular video stream from a client-selected location 12, with the conditional access module 30 permitting (or not) the client 14 to receive the selected stream, depending on the client’s authentication. Consequently, access to the surveillance video streams generated by the sources 18 can be controlled by the hub 16 on a client-by-client basis.” (paragraph [0019])(emphasis added) Thus, transmission is dependent exclusively on authentication by the client irrespective of from where the video originated (transmitter), rather than routing rules between the transmitter and receiver, as called for in claim 18.

Claim 29 is the apparatus counterpart of method claim 18 and therefore is patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18.

#### **Dependent Claims 22 & 30**

Claim 22 states “setting up a connection or transmitting data between transmitter and receiver only based on a triggering event.” In rejecting the claim the Examiner maintains that this limitation is taught by Stewart et al. in Figure 1 and the disclosure associated therewith. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Stewart et al. teaches transmission of data only after a request from the client 14 (paragraphs [0017], [0019]) is received rather than a “triggering event.”

Claim 30 is the apparatus counterpart of method claim 22 and therefore is patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 22.

#### **Dependent Claims 27 & 31**

New claim 27 depends from claim 22 and further specifies “wherein the triggering event is detection of movement by a motion sensor or a regularly scheduled time interval.” As discussed above with respect to claim 22, from which claim 27 depends, Stewart et al. teaches transmission of data only after a request from the client 14 (paragraphs [0017], [0019]) is received rather than a

“triggering event,” much less, the specific triggering event of detection of movement by a motion sensor or a regularly scheduled time interval. Stewart et al. does disclose a motion sensor 39 as an indication of motion in a location 12 but only for the purpose of establishing the frame rate not to trigger setting up a connection or transmitting data. Data is transmitted regardless of whether any motion is detected, only the frame rate of transmission varies depending on the detected motion at a location.

Claim 31 is the apparatus counterpart of method claim 27 and therefore is patentable over the prior art of record for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 15-31 are patentable over the prior art of record and passage of this application to issuance is therefore requested.


**CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

If entry and consideration of the amendments above requires an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this be considered a petition therefor. The Assistant Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee(s) due in this connection to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

**ADDITIONAL FEE**

Please charge any insufficiency of fees, or credit any excess, to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,  
NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By   
Christa Hildebrand  
Reg. No. 34,953  
875 Third Avenue - 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
Phone: (212) 808-0700  
Fax: (212) 808-0844  
Facsimile: (212)808-0844

00138596CH/CFC